



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

*Am*

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/602,306	06/23/2000	Chris Pratley	13237-2570 (MS#142282.1)	1163
27488	7590	06/14/2005	EXAMINER	
MICROSOFT CORPORATION C/O MERCHANT & GOULD, L.L.C. P.O. BOX 2903 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903			BASEHOAR, ADAM L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2178	

DATE MAILED: 06/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/602,306	PRATLEY ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Adam L Basehoar	2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 April 2005.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                            2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

## **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is responsive to communications: The RCE filed 04/27/05
2. Claims 1-9 and 11-30 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller et al (US: 5,896,321 04/20/99) in view Newbold et al (US-5,576,955 11/19/96).
3. Claim 10 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller et al (US: 5,896,321 04/20/99) in view Newbold et al (US-5,576,955 11/19/96) in further view of Oberteuffer et al (6,438,523 08/20/02).
4. Claims 1-30 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 13, and 20 are an independent claim.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
6. Claims 1, 13, and 20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1, 13, and 20, are rendered indefinite when the text selection comprises only one text component, wherein the selected erroneous text component was the one text component from the text selection, wherein the correction scope model determines the scope should be adjusted to a text unit including the erroneous text component and at least one adjacent text component from the text selection. The problem lies in having to include an additional adjacent text component from the text selection when the text selection only includes one text

component. The Examiner suggests that the claims be amended so that the text selection comprises two or more text components.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1-9 and 11-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller et al (US: 5,896,321 04/20/99) in view Newbold et al (US-5,576,955 11/19/96).

-In regard to independent claim 1 and dependent claim 28, Miller et al teach receiving a text input (Fig. 2A: 202) into a text document in a word processing program (column 11, lines 65-67) comprising one or more components.

-Identifying a partial text component (equivalent to erroneous text component) from said one or more text components (Fig. 2A: 204).

-Receiving a selection of an erroneous text component for editing from one or more of the text components by detecting a pause in the receipt of data entry (column 4, lines 32-33)(Fig. 4: 408).

-Receiving a command (Fig. 4: 418) via notice of the pause in the data entry (Fig. 4: 408 & 410 for displaying a list of alternatives to the erroneous text component in a user interface opened into the text document (Fig. 2A).

-Receiving additional characters (edits) (Fig. 4: 402), after displaying the list of alternatives (Fig. 4: Step 418 through Step 402), directly into the text component in the text document, wherein the edit is a partial entry (i.e. one character of the desired alternative.)

-Producing additional filtered list of alternatives in response to receiving additional characters (edits)(Fig.4: 402 & 418) and displaying the revised filtered list (Fig. 4: 418).

-Selecting an alternative from the revised list (column 4, lines 50-53)(Fig. 2A: 210) and replacing directly into the text document the selected alternative (Fig. 2B: 212).

-Closing the user interface (column 5, lines 31-35)(Fig. 4: 428).

Miller et al do not wherein in response to receiving the command to display the list of alternatives to the erroneous text component, the erroneous text component was then submitted to a correction scope model to determine the scope of the correction and if the scope of the correction should be adjusted, receiving from the correction scope model a text unit that includes the erroneous text component and at least one text component from the text selection adjacent the erroneous text component and thus displaying a list of alternatives to the text unit. Newbold teaches wherein selecting an erroneous text component (column 3, lines 62-65: “detect error”), causes the text component to be submitted to a context sensitive correction scope model (Fig. 2: 150) (Which as noted in the Applicant’s Specification (Page 8, lines 13-16), a correction scope model could be a model of likely errors as detailed on in Newbold “broken words, doubled words, spacing, etc (column 4, lines 22-26)), wherein the context sensitive correction scope model determines if the scope of the model should be adjusted by viewing the error as best understood in the text in which it occurs (column 4, lines 22-24) and identifying the text unit (column 3, lines 64-66: “when an error is detected, an error unit is generated....detected error”)

which could include a identified text error and an adjacent text component (i.e. “double words” or “usage”)(column 4, lines 16-30)(Fig. 5B: “all agree” “Never the less”). Newbold also teaches wherein the scope of the text component was not adjusted (i.e. not viewed in its context), communicating the error to display a list of alternatives (Fig. 3: 258, 262, 264). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Miller et al to have utilized the context sensitive correction scope model as shown in Newbold, because Newbold shows the benefit of correcting a plurality of common related erroneous text entries in a single step which would save the user of Miller et al the trouble of correcting each word one at a time (i.e. “double words”, “Never the less” etc). In addition Newbold shows providing a better alternative to a user, for the erroneous input, for more efficient correction by incorporating the surrounding text meaning into the text replacement suggestion (column 4, lines 22-24).

-In regard to independent claim 13 and dependent claim 29, Miller et al teach receiving a text input (Fig. 2A: 202) into a text document in a word processing program (column 11, lines 65-67) comprising one or more components.

-Identifying a partial text component (equivalent to erroneous text component) from said one or more text components (Fig. 2A: 204).

-Receiving a selection of an erroneous text component for editing from one or more of the text components by detecting a pause in the receipt of data entry (column 4, lines 32-33)(Fig. 4: 408).

-Receiving a command (Fig. 4: 418) via notice of the pause in the data entry (Fig. 4: 408 & 410 for displaying a list of alternatives to the erroneous text component in a user interface opened into the text document (Fig. 2A).

-Receiving additional characters (edits) (Fig. 4: 402), after displaying the list of alternatives (Fig. 4: Step 418 through Step 402), directly into the text component in the text document, wherein the edit is a partial entry (i.e. one character of the desired alternative.)

-Producing additional filtered list of alternatives in response to receiving additional characters (edits)(Fig.4: 402 & 418) and displaying the revised filtered list (Fig. 4: 418).

-Continually filtering the list of alternatives (Fig. 4: 418) by continuing to receive a character input (Fig. 4: 402) whenever an acceptance command (Fig. 4: 424) is not received because no suitable alternatives are selected. Miller et al further teach if in response to additional characters and further filtering, no alternative from the list is accepted (Fig. 4: 404), using the inputted word directly into the document (Fig.4).

-Closing the user interface (column 5, lines 31-35)(Fig. 4: 428).

Miller et al do not wherein in response to receiving the command to display the list of alternatives to the erroneous text component, the erroneous text component was then submitted to a correction scope model to determine the scope of the correction and if the scope of the correction should be adjusted, receiving from the correction scope model a text unit that includes the erroneous text component and at least one text component from the text selection adjacent the erroneous text component and thus displaying a list of alternatives to the text unit. Newbold teaches wherein selecting an erroneous text component (column 3, lines 62-65: “detect error”), causes the text component to be submitted to a context sensitive correction scope model (Fig. 2:

150) (Which as noted in the Applicant's Specification (Page 8, lines 13-16), a correction scope model could be a model of likely errors as detailed on in Newbold "broken words, doubled words, spacing, etc (column 4, lines 22-26)), wherein the context sensitive correction scope model determines if the scope of the model should be adjusted by viewing the error as best understood in the text in which it occurs (column 4, lines 22-24) and identifying the text unit (column 3, lines 64-66: "when an error is detected, an error unit is generated....detected error") which could include a identified text error and an adjacent text component (i.e. "double words" or "usage")(column 4, lines 16-30)(Fig. 5B: "all agree" "Never the less"). Newbold also teaches wherein the scope of the text component was not adjusted (i.e. not viewed in its context), communicating the error to display a list of alternatives (Fig. 3: 258, 262, 264). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Miller et al to have utilized the context sensitive correction scope model as shown in Newbold, because Newbold shows the benefit of correcting a plurality of common related erroneous text entries in a single step which would save the user of Miller et al the trouble of correcting each word one at a time (i.e. "double words", "Never the less" etc). In addition Newbold shows providing a better alternative to a user, for the erroneous input, for more efficient correction by incorporating the surrounding text meaning into the text replacement suggestion (column 4, lines 22-24).

-In regard to independent claim 20 and dependent claim 30, Miller et al teach receiving a text input (Fig. 2A: 202) into a text document in a word processing program (column 11, lines 65-67) comprising one or more components.

-Identifying a partial text component (equivalent to erroneous text component) from said one or more text components (Fig. 2A: 204).

-Receiving a selection of an erroneous text component for editing from one or more of the text components by detecting a pause in the receipt of data entry (column 4, lines 32-33)(Fig. 4: 408).

-Receiving a command (Fig. 4: 418) via notice of the pause in the data entry (Fig. 4: 408 & 410 for displaying a list of alternatives to the erroneous text component in a user interface opened into the text document (Fig. 2A).

-Receiving additional characters (edits) (Fig. 4: 402), after displaying the list of alternatives (Fig. 4: Step 418 through Step 402), directly into the text component in the text document, wherein the edit is a partial entry (i.e. one character of the desired alternative.)

-Producing additional filtered list of alternatives in response to receiving additional characters (edits)(Fig.4: 402 & 418) and displaying the revised filtered list (Fig. 4: 418).

- Identifying a completed alternative text component within the list of alternatives associated with the partial entry (Fig. 2A) and displaying the suggested matching completed text alternative component directly into the text document (Fig. 2A). Miller et al further teach receiving an acceptance command with the suggested completion (column 4, lines 50-55)(Fig. 2A) and in response to the acceptance command replacing directly into the document the matching completed alternative (Fig. 2B).

-Closing the user interface (column 5, lines 31-35)(Fig. 4: 428).

Miller et al do not wherein in response to receiving the command to display the list of alternatives to the erroneous text component, the erroneous text component was then submitted

to a correction scope model to determine the scope of the correction and if the scope of the correction should be adjusted, receiving from the correction scope model a text unit that includes the erroneous text component and at least one text component from the text selection adjacent the erroneous text component and thus displaying a list of alternatives to the text unit. Newbold teaches wherein selecting an erroneous text component (column 3, lines 62-65: "detect error"), causes the text component to be submitted to a context sensitive correction scope model (Fig. 2: 150) (Which as noted in the Applicant's Specification (Page 8, lines 13-16), a correction scope model could be a model of likely errors as detailed on in Newbold "broken words, doubled words, spacing, etc (column 4, lines 22-26)) , wherein the context sensitive correction scope model determines if the scope of the model should be adjusted by viewing the error as best understood in the text in which it occurs (column 4, lines 22-24) and identifying the text unit (column 3, lines 64-66: "when an error is detected, an error unit is generated....detected error") which could include a identified text error and an adjacent text component (i.e. "double words" or "usage") (column 4, lines 16-30) (Fig. 5B: "all agree" "Never the less"). Newbold also teaches wherein the scope of the text component was not adjusted (i.e. not viewed in its context), communicating the error to display a list of alternatives (Fig. 3: 258, 262, 264). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Miller et al to have utilized the context sensitive correction scope model as shown in Newbold, because Newbold shows the benefit of correcting a plurality of common related erroneous text entries in a single step which would save the user of Miller et al the trouble of correcting each word one at a time (i.e. "double words", "Never the less" etc). In addition Newbold shows providing a better

alternative to a user, for the erroneous input, for more efficient correction by incorporating the surrounding text meaning into the text replacement suggestion (column 4, lines 22-24).

-In regard to dependent claims 2, and 21, Miller et al teach continually filtering the list of alternatives (Fig. 4: 418) by continuing to receive a character input (Fig. 4: 402) whenever an acceptance command (Fig. 4: 424) is not received because no suitable alternatives are selected. Miller et al further teach if in response to additional characters and further filtering, no alternative from the list is accepted (Fig. 4: 404), using the inputted word directly into the document and closing the user interface (Fig. 4: 428).

-In regard to dependent claim 3, Miller et al teach identifying a completed alternative text component within the list of alternatives associated with the partial entry (Fig. 2A) and displaying the suggested matching completed text alternative component directly into the text document (Fig. 2A). Miller et al further teach receiving an acceptance command with the suggested completion (column 4, lines 50-55)(Fig. 2A) and in response to the acceptance command replacing directly into the document the matching completed alternative (Fig. 2B) and closing the user interface (Fig. 2B).

-In regard to dependent claims 4, 14, and 22, Miller et al teach wherein typing a first character of the selected alternative (Fig.4: 402) directly into the text document (Fig. 2A&B), wherein it would be inherent that the addition of text characters (Fig. 4: 402) would be at the

location of the text component because otherwise the word's components would not be symmetric in the document and unnecessarily difficult to read.

-In regard to dependent claims 5-6, 8, 15, and 23, Miller et al teach wherein the text input (selection) into a data file (text document) could include stochastic input sources such as a voice recognition and a hand-writing recognition device (column 1, lines 22-34).

-In regard to dependent claims 7, 9, 16-17, 24-25, Miller et al teach wherein the text input (selection) into a data file (text document) could include stochastic input sources such as a voice recognition and a hand-writing recognition device (column 1, lines 22-34). Miller et al also teach being able to input one character at a time (Fig. 4: 402) and as stated above in claims 4, 14, and 22 it would have been inherent that the addition of text characters (Fig. 4: 402) would be at the location of the text component because otherwise the word's components would not be symmetric in the document and unnecessarily difficult to read.

-In regard to dependent claims 11-12, 18-19, and 26-27, Miller et al teach a computer system and a computer readable medium having computer executable code (Fig. 1: 20)

9. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller et al (US: 5,896,321 04/20/99) in view Newbold et al (US-5,576,955 11/19/96) in further view of Oberteuffer et al (6,438,523 08/20/02).

-In regard to dependent claim 10, neither Miller et al nor Newbold teach wherein one of the stochastic text input devices is a vision-based recognition device for recognizing gestures. Oberteuffer et al teach multiple stochastic text inputs (Abstract) as well as a gesture interface for text input (Fig. 9: 902:904)(column 7, lines 44-56). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art for at the time of the invention, for Miller et al to have utilized Oberteuffer et al gesture input device for inputting text, because it would have allowed users unable to use the speech to text of Miller et al to input text using sign language or other well known gestures.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

10. Applicant's arguments filed 04/27/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

-In regard to independent claims 1, 13, and 20, Applicant argues that the combination of the Miller et al reference (US-5,896,321) in view of the Newbold et al reference (US-5,576,955) fails to teach or suggest the amended limitations of “receiving a selection of an erroneous text component from the one or more text components of the text selection”, “receiving a command to display a list of alternatives to the erroneous text component”, and “in response to receiving the command to display the list of alternatives to the erroneous text component.” The examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant in regard to the first two added limitations. The Miller reference clearly teaches the first limitation of receiving a selection of an erroneous text component for editing from one or more of the text components (Fig. 2A) by detecting a pause in the receipt of data entry (column 4, lines 32-33)(Fig. 4: 408). The selection of the component

was an automatic determination based on the partial data entry satisfying certain search criteria (Fig. 4: 410) and a user determined pause in the data entry (Fig. 4: 408). As claimed, the Examiner feels the limitation has been met by the Miller reference and suggests that the mode of “receiving a selection” be further refined to differentiate over the prior art of record. The Miller reference also clearly teaches the second limitation of receiving a command (Fig. 4: 4188) via notice of the pause in the data entry (Fig. 4: 408) for displaying a list of alternatives to the erroneous text component (Fig. 2A). As shown above in the rejection of the claims, the third limitation would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art in view of the benefitis taught by the Newbold reference.

Applicant also argues in regard to the above mentioned independent claims that that the combination of the Miller et al reference (US-5,896,321) in view of the Newbold et al reference (US-5,576,955) fails to teach or suggest submitting the erroneous text component to a correction scope model. While the Examiner agrees with the Applicant that the Miller reference fails to teach this limitation, the Examiner respectfully disagree and believes that the combination of Miller and Newbold do indeed teach said limitations. As discussed above in the rejection of the claims as well as in the telephone interview held 04/05/05, the correction scope model taught in the Newbold reference relates mainly to text errors which include context sensitive double words. The context sensitive correction module of Newbold examines the text components in view of the surrounding text (i.e. increasing the scope of the text component) to create a text unit, and thus by doing so provide better alternatives for erroneous text correction. This means that each text component of Newbold was treated as an erroneous text component as the text was scanned for errors, with each text component having the potential for its scope to be corrected to

include adjacent words. The combination of the Miller reference and Newbold teach wherein it would have been beneficial for Miller, after receiving a command to display the list of alternatives (Fig. 4: 418) to the erroneous text component, to have submitted said component to the correction scope model of Newbold to evaluate adjacent text in view of their context, for the advantages taught above in the rejection of the claims. The use of the CorrectWith text in Newbold as discussed by applicant (Remarks: Page 15) does not limit the combination of the two references as it was not relied upon in Newbold as being part of the correction scope model.

-In regard to dependent claim 10, Applicant traverses said rejection. The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant and believes the rejection as applied to the claimed limitations is proper.

### ***Conclusion***

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US-5,855,000	12-1998	Waibel et al.
US-2003/0036900	02-2003	Weise, David Neal
US-6,490,549	12-2002	Ulicny et al.
US-5,761,687	06-1998	Hon et al.
US-6,618,697	09-2003	Kantrowitz et al

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Adam L Basehoar whose telephone number is (571)-272-4121. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 7:00am - 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steve Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ALB

William L. Basehoar  
WILLIAM BASHORE  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
6/9/2005